



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

52
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/843,102	04/24/2001	John D. DeTreville	MS1-718US	1064

22801 7590 03/28/2005
LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

HENNING, MATTHEW T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/843,102

Applicant(s)

DETREVILLE, JOHN D.

Examiner

Matthew T Henning

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 January 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 and 20-52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-17 and 20-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 April 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/09/2004.
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/24/05
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

This action is in response to the communication filed on 01/18/2005.

DETAILED ACTION

1. All rejections and Objections not specifically set forth below have been withdrawn.
2. Claims 18-19 and 53-57 have been cancelled.
3. Claims 1-17, and 20-52 have been examined.

Title

4. The title of the invention is acceptable.

Priority

5. No claim for priority has been made for this application.
6. The effective filing date for the subject matter defined in the pending claims in this application is 04/24/2001.

Drawings

7. The drawings filed on 04/24/2001 are acceptable for examination proceedings.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-8, 11-15, 29-36, and 38-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over van Zoest et al. (US Patent Number 6,496,802) hereinafter referred to as van

Art Unit: 2131

Zoest, and further in view of Cooper et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2001/0051996) hereinafter referred to as Cooper.

10. Regarding claim 1 van Zoest disclosed a system comprising: a source database (See van Zoest Fig. 1 Element 135) storing a plurality of highly compressed content pieces (See van Zoest Col. 8 Paragraph 3 and Col. 7 Paragraph 6); and a content player (See van Zoest Fig. 11), coupled to the source database (See van Zoest Col. 18 Paragraphs 4-5, Col. 19 Paragraph 1, and Col. 11 Paragraphs 2-3), including, an interface to receive a subset of the plurality of highly compressed content pieces from the source database (See van Zoest Col. 11 Paragraph 3), a storage device to store the subset (it was inherent that when the content was downloaded it was stored in order to play the content as disclosed above), a comparator to compare the subset to content and determine whether the content matches any of the plurality of highly compressed content pieces in the subset (See van Zoest Col. 5 Paragraph 3 Lines 7-12), and a resolver to take particular action in response to the comparator indicating the content matches one of the plurality of highly compressed content pieces in the subset (See van Zoest Col. 5 Paragraph 3 Lines 1-6, and 12-15), but van Zoest failed to disclose an output controller to render the content if the comparator indicated the content did not match any of the highly compressed content pieces in the subset.

Cooper teaches that in a content providing system, in order to protect against the use of copied content, a comparison should be made with all the content currently being played by other users and playing the content if no match is found (See Cooper Paragraph 0124).

It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of invention to employ the teachings of Copper in the content providing system of van Zoest by

Art Unit: 2131

comparing the content of the user with the content being played by other users and playing the content if no match was found. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to provide protection against the use of duplicated content.

11. Claim 2 recites that the comparator is to compare the subset to content being played by the content player (See van Zoest Col. 15 Paragraph 4 and Col. 16 Paragraphs 3-4).

12. Claim 3 recites that the content player is coupled to the source database via the Internet (See Van Zoest Col. 19 Paragraph 2).

13. Claims 4-6 recite that the plurality of highly compressed content pieces comprise a plurality of highly compressed audio, video, and audio/video pieces (See van Zoest Col. 5 Paragraph 2).

14. Claim 7 recites that the interface is further to subsequently communicate with the source database, retrieve a new subset of the plurality of highly compressed content pieces from the source database, and replace the subset in the storage device with the new subset (See van Zoest Col. 2 Paragraph 5 wherein it was disclosed that the content was streamed to the user and it was therefore inherent that the newly streamed data replaced the older streamed data).

15. Claim 8 recites a content source coupled to the content player, and wherein the content player further comprises a compressor to receive content from the content source, generate a highly compressed content piece based on the received content, and add the generated highly compressed content piece to the subset in the storage device (See van Zoest Col. 15 Paragraph 2 wherein the user uploads the content to the server, and Col. 7 Paragraph 6).

Art Unit: 2131

16. Claim 11 recites that the storage device is further to store the content (See van Zoest Col. 5 Paragraph 5).

17. Claim 12 recites a content source, coupled to the content player, from which the content is received (See Van Zoest Fig. 1 Element 150 and Col. 6 paragraph 3).

18. Claim 13 recites that the content player receives the content from the content source in its entirety before playback of the content begins (See van Zoest Abstract wherein it was disclosed that the content was downloaded).

19. Claim 14 recites that the comparator determine whether the content matches any of the plurality of highly compressed content pieces in the subset by comparing a first set of feature values associated with each of the plurality of highly compressed content pieces with a second set of feature values associated with the content, and checking whether at least a threshold number of the first set of feature values is within threshold distance of is to the second set of feature values (See van Zoest Figures 5-6 and Col. 15 Paragraph 2).

20. Claim 15 recites that the first set of feature values and the second set of feature values each comprises a set of audio energy features (See van Zoest Figures 5-6 and Col. 16 Paragraph 2).

21. Claim 29 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above.

22. Regarding claim 30, van Zoest and Cooper disclosed the media being a song (See van Zoest Col. 2 Paragraph 2).

23. Regarding claim 31, van Zoest and Cooper disclosed the media being a movie (See van Zoest Col. 2 Paragraph 2).

24. Claim 32 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 2 above.

Art Unit: 2131

25. Claim 33 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above.
26. Claim 34 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above.
27. Claim 35 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 7 above.
28. Claim 36 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 8 above.
29. Claims 38 and 39 are rejected for the same reasons as claims 14 and 15 above.
30. Claim 40 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above and further because van Zoest and Cooper disclosed the use of software to accomplish these tasks (See van Zoest Col. 13 Paragraph 6).
31. Claim 41 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above.
32. Claim 42 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 7 above.
33. Claim 43 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above.
34. Claim 44 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 8 above.
35. Claim 45 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 11 above.
36. Claim 46 is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1 and 15 above.
37. Claim 47 is rejected for the same reasons as claims 4-6 above.
38. Claim 48 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above.
39. Claim 49 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 7 above.
40. Claim 50 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 8 above.
41. Claim 51 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 14 above.
42. Claim 52 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 15 above.

Art Unit: 2131

43. Claims 9-10, 16-17, 20-28, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over van Zoest, and further in view of Fucarile et al. (US Patent Number 6,766,305) hereinafter referred to as Fucarile.

44. Regarding claim 9 van Zoest disclosed a system comprising: a source database (See van Zoest Fig. 1 Element 135) storing a plurality of highly compressed content pieces (See van Zoest Col. 8 Paragraph 3 and Col. 7 Paragraph 6); and a content player (See van Zoest Fig. 11), coupled to the source database (See van Zoest Col. 18 Paragraphs 4-5, Col. 19 Paragraph 1, and Col. 11 Paragraphs 2-3), including, an interface to receive a subset of the plurality of highly compressed content pieces from the source database (See van Zoest Col. 11 Paragraph 3), a storage device to store the subset (it was inherent that when the content was downloaded it was stored in order to play the content as disclosed above), a comparator to compare the subset to content and determine whether the content matches any of the plurality of highly compressed content pieces in the subset (See van Zoest Col. 5 Paragraph 3 Lines 7-12), and a resolver to take particular action in response to the comparator indicating the content matches one of the plurality of highly compressed content pieces in the subset (See van Zoest Col. 5 Paragraph 3 Lines 1-6, and 12-15), but van Zoest failed to disclose that the storage device is further to store a plurality of licenses identifying content that a user of the content player is authorized to playback, and wherein the particular action comprises the resolver checking whether one of the plurality of licenses corresponds to the content.

Fucarile teaches that in a content player, the content should be contain a license which can be checked against a license server in order to verify proper access rights to the content (See Fucarile Summary of the Invention).

It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of invention to employ the teachings of Fucarile in the content providing system of Cooper by verifying a license for the content once the content was identified. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to provide protection against illicit copies of the content.

45. Claim 10 recites that the plurality of highly compressed content pieces in the subset further indicates whether one of the plurality of licenses is required for playback of the content (See van Zoest Col. 11 Paragraph 5).

46. Claim 16 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 9 above.

47. Claim 17 recites that the comparator is to compare the subset to content being played by the system (See van Zoest Col. 15 Paragraph 4 and Col. 16 Paragraphs 3-4).

48. Claim 20 recites that the memory is further to store the content (See van Zoest Col. 5 Paragraph 5).

49. Regarding claim 21 and 22, van Zoest and Fucarile disclosed acquiring content from CDs (See van Zoest Col. 6 Paragraph 3 and Fig. 1).

50. Claim 23 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 9 above.

51. Claim 24 recites a compressor, coupled to the memory, to receive content and generate the one or more highly compressed content pieces (See van Zoest Col. 15 Paragraph 2 wherein the user uploads the content to the server, and Col. 7 Paragraph 6).

52. Claim 25 recites that the comparator determine whether the content matches any of the plurality of highly compressed content pieces in the subset by comparing a first set of feature values associated with each of the plurality of highly compressed content pieces with a second

set of feature values associated with the content, and checking whether at least a threshold number of the first set of feature values is within threshold distance of is to the second set of feature values (See van Zoest Figures 5-6 and Col. 15 Paragraph 2).

53. Claim 26 recites that the first set of feature values and the second set of feature values each comprises a set of audio energy features (See van Zoest Figures 5-6 and Col. 16 Paragraph 2).

54. Regarding claim 27, van Zoest disclosed the players being portable (See van Zoest Col. 4 Paragraph 1).

55. Claim 28 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 10 above.

56. Claim 37 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 9 above.

Response to Arguments

57. Applicant's arguments, filed 1/18/2005, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 9-10, 16-17, 20-28, and 37 under 35 USC 102(e) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of van Zoest and further in view of Fucarile.

58. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8, 11-15, 29-36, and 38-52 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

59. Claims 1-17, and 20-52 have been rejected.

60. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. Roberts et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,987,525) disclosed a system for synchronizing content played complementary to a musical recording.

b. Wiser et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,385,596) disclosed a system for secure online music distribution involving licenses.

c. Yankowski (U.S. Patent Number 6,388,957) disclosed a system for identifying a CD in order to display information about the CD during playback.

d. Bharat (U.S. Patent Number 6,577,735) disclosed a system for creating backup copies of compressed audio for playback on a portable audio player.


e. Arkin et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0152262) disclosed a system in which content is compared with known copies of content in order to determine if the content is infringing on the copy protection of the known content.

61. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew T Henning whose telephone number is (571) 272-3790. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4.

62. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2131

63. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Matthew Henning
Assistant Examiner
Art Unit 2131
3/24/2005



AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100